

V. REMARKS

Along with the Amendment, Applicant hereby files an Information Disclosure Statement with one prior art reference.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending Application No. 10/697,007. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as now amended overcomes any issue regarding conflicting claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action asserts that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title of the invention as indicated above is changed to -- GAMING MACHINE HAVING A COMMON ILLUMINATION DEVICE --.

Claim 4 is objected to because of an informality. The claim is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claimed the subject matter of the invention. The claim is amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ozaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0031658). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the **"front illumination device"** for illuminating the first display device and the **"rear illumination means"** for illuminating the first display means from a rear side (LEDs 29 correspond to them).

Since the **"light source 9"** disclosed in Ozaki illuminates the **"back side display 2"** from front side, it can possibly correspond to the **"front illumination**

means" in amended claim 1.

However, there is no **"front illumination means"** for illuminating the back side display 2 from rear side in Ozaki. That is, Ozaki does not at all disclose the **"rear illumination device"** now recited in amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as amended. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to teach a rear illumination device as claimed. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the applied art.

Furthermore, the contents of claim 2, now canceled, are incorporated into claim 1. Especially, the point of amending claim 1 is that **"a plurality of display parts"** is included in the **"first display device"** and the **"display parts"** have the **"light transmittance"**. Also, there is additionally made amendments that the **"second display device"** is constructed from the **"liquid crystal display device"** including the **"liquid crystal panel"**.

There are further made amendments that the front illumination device included in the common illumination device illuminates the first display device from a front side and the liquid crystal panel from a rear side, and that the rear illumination device arranged within the first display device illuminates the first display device from a rear side and the liquid crystal panel by light passed through the symbol display parts.

The above mentioned structure added in accordance with amendments to claim 1 are not at all disclosed or taught by any recited documents. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, amended claim 1 is patentable over the applied art.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Claim 2 is canceled and, as a result, the rejection as applied thereto is now moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Shimizu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,398,217). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 6,251,013). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claims 7-11 also include features not shown in the applied art.

Further, Applicants assert that there are also reasons other than those set forth above why the pending claims are patentable. Applicants hereby reserve the right to submit those other reasons and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein in future papers.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: , 2007

By: _____
Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (three months)
 Information Disclosure Statement (US 2002/0175466)


DC276733.DOC

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2007

By:



Carl Schalkowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 955-3750

Fax: (202) 955-3751

Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal
 Petition for Extension of Time (three months)
 Information Disclosure Statement (US 2002/0175466)

DC276733.DOC